REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10, 12-18, 20, 21, 23-25 and 27-36 are currently pending; Claims 1-10, 12-18, 20, 21, 23-25, 27, and 28 are amended; Claims 29-36 are added; and Claim 19 is cancelled without prejudice by the present amendment. Claims 11, 22, and 26 have been previously cancelled.

Support for changes to Claims 1, 5, and 20 is found in the application as originally filed, at least at Figure 3 and the corresponding written description in the specification. Support for new Claims 29-36 is found in original Claims 1, 5, and 20. The remaining changes to the claims address minor informalities. Thus, no new matter is added.

The outstanding Official Action objected to the specification; objected to the claims; rejected Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 101; rejected Claims 4, 6, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; rejected Claims 1-10, 12, 13, 15-21, 23-25, 27 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over French Patent No. 2822255 to Paolucci et al. (hereinafter Paolucci) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,587,883 to Rajakarunanayake (hereinafter Raj) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,802,000 to Greene et al. (hereinafter Greene); and rejected Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Paolucci, Raj, and Greene, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,959,420 to Mitchell et al. (hereinafter Mitchell).

Applicants respectfully traverse the objection to the specification. According to 37 C.F.R. § 1.57(d), "[a]n incorporation by reference by hyperlink or other form of browser executable code is not permitted." However, the hyperlinks in the specification at page 9, line 11-12 and page 10, line 1 are non-limiting examples of a result of encoding hyperlinks to enable a user to access bonus material on a server according to an embodiment of an invention. Since the hyperlinks in Applicants' specification do not incorporate subject matter

by reference, Applicants respectfully submit that the use of the hyperlinks in the specification is proper. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Regarding the objections to the claims, Claims 1-10, 12-18, 20, 21, 23-25, 27, and 28 are amended as suggested by the outstanding Official Action. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the objection to Claims 1-10, 12-18, 20, 21, 23-25, 27, and 28 be withdrawn.

Claim 18 is amended to recite a "computer readable medium" as suggested by the outstanding Official Action. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

Further, regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Claims 4, 6, and 18 are amended as suggested by the outstanding Official Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 4, 6, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the Claims 1-10, 12, 13, 15-21, 23-25, 27, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Paolucci, Raj, and Greene, with respect to amended independent Claims 1, 5, 18, and 20.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to a method for securing an access to a predetermined area of a target server. The method includes, *inter alia*, providing an information file on a copy protected record carrier. The information file includes a project identifier or an address of an authentication server with which an application using said information file can communicate. The method further includes automatically initiating and confirming, by the authentication server using information contained in the record carrier, a connection between a computer on which the application is started and the predetermined area of the target server that is identified by the address of the authentication server or the project identifier. Claims 5, 18, and 20 include similar features directed to different classes of inventions.

13

Applicants submit that automatically initiating and confirming a connection using information on the copy protected record carrier allows a user of an authentication server to advantageously avoid complicated interactions, such as typing long serial codes.[1]

Applicants respectfully submit that Paolucci, Raj, and Greene fail to teach or suggest each of the features of the independent claims.

Paolucci describes an access device implemented as a software program on a CD for generation of passwords and access codes.[2] Paolucci indicates that a confidential character code unique to the CD is required to access programs on the CD.[3] Paolucci further indicates that the character code is only obtained by gaining possession of the CD.[4] However, Paolucci is silent regarding any copy protected CD.

Thus, Paolucci fails to disclose or suggest "providing an information file on a copy protected record carrier" as recited in Claim 1, and as similarly recited in Claims 5, 18, and 20.[5]

Applicants respectfully traverse the assertion in the Official Action that Paolucci discloses an inability to reproduce the confidential character code to provide secured access to the CD (e.g., a copy protected record carrier).[6] However, Paolucci indicates that the confidential character code merely prevents unauthorized access to the CD. Paolucci neither discloses nor suggest that the CD of Paolucci itself is *copy protected*. That is, if a third party obtained or reproduced the confidential character code, Paolucci neither discloses nor suggests that third party couldn't copy the programs from the CD of Paolucci onto another program. Accordingly, using a confidential character to provide secured access to the CD, as

---

[1] See Paolucci at page 3, lines 9-12.
[2] See Paolucci at page 7, line 1; page 11; and page 13.
[3] See Paolucci at page 9
[4] See Paolucci at page 9.
[5] See specification at page 7, lines 5-11.
[6] See Official Action of June 6, 2007 at page 6, lines 1-5.

described in Paolucci, is different from "a copy protected record carrier" as recited in Claim 1, and as similarly recited in Claims 5, 18, and 20.

In addition, the outstanding Official Action acknowledges that Paolucci fails to disclose or suggest that "an authentication server can initiate and confirm a connection between a computer on which said application is started," as recited in original Claim 1. To cure this deficiency, the outstanding Official Action relies on Raj.[7]

Raj describes a method for providing secured access to a target location. Figure 3 of Raj illustrates a DSL access multiplexor 310 that provides a physical and electrical interface to user locations on local loops 135-A and 135-B. Further, Raj describes that Gateway 320 and authentication server 330 provide secure connections to secure location 160. Raj describes that the authentication server 330 may be pre-configured with different user identifiers and corresponding authentication information.[8] Raj further describes that the authentication server 330 may provide a convenient user interface for the user to enter a user identifier and authentication information.[9] Alternatively, Raj describes that the user may request access to a secure location by operating a physical switch.[10]

However, Raj fails to disclose or suggest "automatically initiating and confirming, by the authentication server, using information contained in the record carrier, a connection between a computer and the predetermined area of the target server," as recited in amended Claim 1, and as similarly recited in Claims 5, 18, and 20. Raj indicates that access to a secured location is provided via (1) a user providing user authentication information via a user interface, or alternatively, (2) the user operating a physical switch. Raj neither discloses nor suggests that the authentication server 330 automatically initiates and confirms a connection using information contained in a record carrier. That is, a user entering

---

[7] See Official Action of June 6, 2007 at page 6, last paragraph to page 7, first paragraph
[8] See Raj at col. 6, lines 34-43.
[9] See Raj at col. 6, lines 50-53.
[10] See Raj at col. 4, lines 6-8.

authentication information via an interface or operating a physical switch is not "information contained in the record carrier" as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, contrary to Applicants' claimed inventions, the method of Raj requires complicated user interactions, such as providing a password.

The outstanding Official Action acknowledges that Paolucci and Raj fail to disclose or suggest features similar to "verifying, by said authentication server, whether a changing parameter of the computer, which is a randomly generated number or a computer system time transmitted from said computer, was previously used." To cure the deficiencies of Paolucci and Raj, the outstanding Official Action relies on Greene at column 1, lines 50-52 and 55-60.[11]

The cited portion of Greene describes an authentication technique using a one-time pad of passwords. Greene indicates that after each valid authentication (i.e., transaction) performed using a one-time pad of passwords, a valid password between parties is synchronously changed. Greene describes that by using a one-time pad of passwords, exposure of a password over an insecure channel does not compromise the security of subsequent transactions because knowing a previously valid password does not provide any information about the validity of subsequent passwords. Therefore, Greene merely describes using a new password for each session.

However, Greene fails to disclose or suggest "a changing parameter of the computer," as recited in Claim 1, and as similarly recited in Claims 5, 18, and 20, because a password is not a parameter of a computer. That is, the passwords of Greene are means for authenticating a transaction between two parties instead of a parameter of the computers for the two transacting parties.

---

[11] See Official Action of June 6, 2007 at page 8, lines 3-15.

Furthermore, while <u>Greene</u> describes that a password used between transacting parties

is changed for each new session, <u>Greene</u> fails to disclose or suggest a password that is

"randomly generated" or is a "computer system time" as recited in Claim 1, and as similarly

recited in Claims 5, 18, and 20.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that <u>Paolucci</u>, <u>Raj</u>, and <u>Greene</u> fail to disclose or

suggest all the features of amended Claims 1, 5, 18, and 20, and the claims depending

therefrom. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-10, 12, 13,

15-21, 23-25, 27, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 16 recites that the "predetermined area on said target server comprises bonus

material related to the content." In a non-limiting example, bonus material may include

music video clips related to audio content on the copy protected record carrier.[12]

The outstanding Official Action asserts that an email address search list or an

international phone book of <u>Paolucci</u> is considered as bonus material included in a

predetermined email URL address website.[13] <u>Paolucci</u> fails to disclose or suggest that the

predetermined email URL address website is on the CD. Furthermore, as discussed above,

the programs of <u>Paolucci</u> are merely used to generate passwords and access codes. <u>Paolucci</u>

neither discloses nor suggests that these programs are related to materials on the Internet sites

the passwords and access codes are generated. Thus, <u>Paolucci</u> fails to teach or suggest that a

"predetermined area on said target server comprises bonus material related to the content," as

recited in Claim 16.

As <u>Raj</u> and <u>Greene</u> fail to cure this deficiency of <u>Paolucci</u>, Applicants submit that

<u>Paolucci</u>, <u>Raj</u>, and <u>Greene</u> fail to disclose or suggest all the features of Claim 16. Thus,

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) also

be withdrawn on this independent ground.

---

[12] See specification at page 6, lines 10-13.
[13] See Official Action of June 6, 2007 at page 21, lines 13-17.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Paolucci, Raj, Greene, and Mitchell.

As outlined above, Paolucci, Raj, and Greene fail to disclose or suggest all the features of amended Claim 5, from which Claim 14 depends. As Mitchell does not cure the deficiencies of these references, Applicants submit that the applied references fail to disclose or suggest all the features of Claim 14.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 14, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) also be withdrawn.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 5, 18, and 20, and claims depending therefrom, are allowable.

Consequently, in view of the foregoing discussion and present amendment, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Zachary S. Stern
Registration No. 54,719

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)
BDL:ZS:SP\la